

Appl. No. : 09/591,026
Filed : June 9, 2000

REMARKS

As a supplement to the amendment and response filed January 25, 2005, Applicant respectfully submits the following amendment and remarks in connection with the above-captioned application.

Claim 18 has been added. Upon the entry of the amendment, Claims 11-18 are pending in this application. New Claim 18 includes the same claim terms as Claim 11 except that “a scheduler for scheduling...” recited in Claim 11 has been replaced with “means for scheduling...” in Claim 18. Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment requires only a cursory review by the Examiner, and does not introduce any new matter to the application. Furthermore, new Claim 18 does not raise any new issue. MPEP 714.13. Thus, entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Patentability of New Claim 18

In the previous Office Action, dated October 26, 2004, Claims 11-17 have been allowed, over the prior art of record, by the Examiner. Since Claim 18 recites substantially the same claim terms as allowed Claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that new Claim 18 is also allowable over the prior art of record.

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

Applicant further wishes to respond to the comments on the claims made on pages 7-8 of the Action. With regard to the Examiner’s comments on allowed Claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that the means-plus-function claim terms should be construed based on the following disclosure and equivalents thereof rather than the portions identified in the Office Action:

i) “Means for entering ...” should be construed based on the following disclosure and equivalents thereof: the specification at page 7, lines 5-9, page 20, line 11 through page 21, line 19, and page 34, lines 21-22, and Figure 26.

ii) “Means for transforming ...” should be construed based on the following disclosure and equivalents thereof: the specification at page 26, lines 19-20, page 30, line 15 through page 34, line 5, and page 34, lines 27-30, and Figure 26.

Appl. No. : 09/591,026
Filed : June 9, 2000

iii) "Means for execution ..." should be construed based on the following disclosure and equivalents thereof: the specification at page 15, line 3 through page 16, line 2, and page 35, lines 7-12, and Figure 26.

With regard to "a scheduler for scheduling..." recited in Claim 11, Applicant respectfully submits that the "scheduler" element must not be interpreted as a means-plus-function element since the element does not recite means-plus-function language. The Examiner's confirmation of this is respectfully requested in the next Action.

Claim 18 recites "means for scheduling ..." This scheduling means should be construed based on the following disclosure and equivalents thereof: the specification at page 15, lines 21-27, page 33, lines 3-9, and page 34, line 30 through page 35, line 12, and Figures 26 and 27.


CONCLUSION

If the Examiner has any remaining concerns regarding Applicant's foregoing remarks, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the indicated telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 2/24/05

By: 

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550

1253636_1
022205